REMARKS

Applicant's invention is directed to a method of fabricating a circuit board that includes a non-continuous conductive layer. The method comprises forming a first layer of conductive material over an insulating layer, removing portions of the conductive material of the first layer to define a first circuit pattern and a first rail area that is electrically isolated from the first circuit pattern, and removing portions of the conductive material of the first layer from the first rail area.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification, and specifically the Abstract. With this Amendment, applicant has addressed the Examiner's concerns by providing a revised Abstract in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

Response to the Double Patenting Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-15 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-12 of applicant's own prior U.S. Patent No. 6,729,024. Accompanying this paper is a terminal disclaimer signed by an attorney of record. Applicant believes that the terminal disclaimer overcomes this ground of rejection.

Response to the Rejection Under 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-10 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over "Applicant Admitted Prior Art," ("APA") specifically Figs. 1 and 2 and the Background portion of the specification, or Tsukamoto (US 5841194). The Examiner asserted that "APA" taught a method of fabricating a circuit board "as claimed by the present invention." The Examiner further asserted that Tsukamoto "inherently" disclosed the removal of portions of a conductive material to define a first circuit pattern and a first rail area, and then "removing portions of said conductive material of said first layer from said first rail area," referring to Tsukamoto's Fig. 1.

Applicant submits that neither APA nor Tsukamoto teaches or suggests the presently claimed invention. As shown and discussed by applicant, specification page 6, paragraph [0027], the prior art circuit board depicted in Fig. 2 includes first and second rail areas 201 and 202 that "include a large amount of conductive material" that "stretches from one end of the

beginning at page 28, line 25. No new matter has been added. This amendment is believed to ameliorate any potential for indefiniteness in the claims. Therefore, Applicants kindly request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being a duplicate of Claim 31, Applicants offer the above amendment. As amended, Claim 31 depends from Claim 30, rather than Claim 28. Therefore, Applicants kindly request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In response to the provisional rejection of Claims 26-31 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 24-25 of co-pending U.S. Pat.

Application No. 09/363,868, Applicants have filed an amendment in the co-pending application canceling Claims 24-25. The subject matter of these claims, finding support in the same specification of the instant divisional application, have been introduced as new Claims 42 and 43 of the instant application. No new matter has been added. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the provisional obviousness-type double-patenting rejection has been obviated and kindly request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Additionally, Claim 23 of co-pending U.S. Pat. Application No. 09/363,868 has been cancelled, and the complete subject matter introduced as new Claim 44. Finally, the subject matter previously recited in the concluding paragraphs of Claims 26 and 27 has been reintroduced as new dependent Claims 40 and 41, respectively. No new matter has been introduced. Moreover, as these are broadening amendments, no surrender or disclaimer of subject matter relative to these limitations has been made, nor should be implied.

On the merits of the claims, as amended Claim 26 recites, *inter alia*, a method of manufacturing a liquid crystal display device comprising forming liquid crystal to be oriented

substantially vertically to the first substrate when no voltage is applied across the common electrode and the pixel electrode. Claim 26 further recites forming vertical orientation films on both surfaces of the liquid crystal layer. Claim 26 further recites disposing a common electrode and a pixel electrode in different layers through an interlayer separation film formed of transparent insulating material.

In contrast to the claimed invention, these steps are neither disclosed nor suggested by Shimida, Xu and Kim, taken alone or in any combination. As can be seen in Fig. 2 of Shimida, both the picture electrode (12) and the counter electrode (13) lie on the insulation layer (19), and both are covered by and alignment layer (116). However, there is no teaching or suggestion of an interlayer separation film as recited in Claim 26. Other embodiments of Shimida include alternate arrangements of the common and picture electrodes, but none meet the language of the instant invention. Further, Shimid specifically teaches that the liquid crystal molecules are make an angle of less than 90° when no voltage is applied (See Col. 14, lines 15-19). This teaches away from the claimed invention, which recites that the liquid crystals are oriented substantially vertically when no voltage is applied.

Xu is offered for its teaching of the use of positive and negative retardation films for improving display contrast. Kim is offered to teach the forming of a pre-tilt angle on an LCD device. However, neither modifying reference offers any teaching or suggestion to reconcile the deficiencies of Shimida relative to Claim 26 as highlighted above. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Further, to establish *prima facie* obviousness there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference. *See, In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355, 47 USPQ2d 1453,